UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/808,036	03/24/2004	Dan Scott Johnson	100201135-1	5669

22879   7590   01/30/2008
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
GRAHAM, PAUL J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2623	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/30/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM
mkraft@hp.com
ipa.mail@hp.com

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/808,036	JOHNSON, DAN SCOTT
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Paul J. Graham	2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>26 November 2007</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-18,20-22 and 24-28* is/are pending in the application.

  4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-18,20-22 and 24-28* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>3/24/04</u> is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

  a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

    1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

    2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

    3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in

37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is

eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR

1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been

withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/26/07 has been

entered.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18, 20-22, and 24-28 have been

considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.   New references have

been cited to reject the amended claims.

Obviousness Type Double Patenting Rejection

3.   The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine
grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the
unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent
and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees.   A nonstatutory obviousness-
type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not
identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the
reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or
would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d
1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d
2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re
Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164
USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In *re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA
1969).

       A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or
1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a

nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b). Claim 1 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/808,015. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant application recites an "audio/video component networking system" and the copending application # 10/808,015 recites an "audio/video component networking system". See below.

Claim 1 of US Pat App#: 10/808,015	Claim 1 of Instant App#: 10/808,036
1. **An audio/video (A/V) component networking system, comprising:** a centralized storage system adapted to communicatively receive a plurality of source components, each *source component* adapted to provide A/V program data; and a sink component disposed remote from the storage system and communicatively disposed between the storage system and a <u>presentation device</u>, the sink component adapted to receive A/V program data from at least one of the plurality of source components and transmit the A/V program data to the presentation device, the sink component adapted to enable a user to select an A/V menu interface associated with at least one	1. **An audio/video (A/V) component networking system, comprising:** a *source component*, a <u>presentation device</u>; and a sink component disposed remote from the source component and adapted to control presentation of A/V program data received from the source component on the presentation device, the sink component adapted to transmit a command to the source component to control streaming of an A/V menu interface of the source component for display on the presentation device.

of the plurality of source components for display on the presentation device, and wherein the sink component is configured to control streaming of the selected A/V menu interface from the corresponding source component to the presentation device.	

Note the comparison above; claim 1 of the instant application is not patentably distinct from claim 1 of US Patent Application # 10/808,015.

For example, claim 1 of the instant application is broader in scope than claim 1 of US Patent Application # 10/808,015 because it does not recite a centralized storage system adapted to receive a plurality of source components; however, the specification for the US Patent Application # 10/808,036 allows for such a subsystem in the invention (see [0023-24 of the US Patent Application # 10/808,036) and such an addition to the system in order to allow for recordable content to be captured by the system is possible. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of the US Patent Application # 10/808,036 with a centralized storage system in order to allow system users to present recorded content with system resources, making the claims even more similar.

Additionally, instant claim 1 of the US Patent Application # 10/808,036 recites a presentation device, a source component, and a sink component that controls streaming of the source component; each of these elements are recited in the instant application as well. A plurality of source components are recited in the US Patent Application # 10/808,015 and it would be possible to broaden the US Patent Application # 10/808,036 to include multiple source components to allow for different programming. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the US Patent Application #

10/808,036 with multiple source components in order to allow for a multiplicity of programming for the user to choose.

Claim 1 of the US Patent Application # 10/808,036 (instant application) recites a sink component remote from the source component, this is possible to narrow the claim 1 of the US Patent Application # 10/808,036 (similar to claim 1 of US Patent Application # 10/808,015) in order to distinguish a controlling unit from a content source unit. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the US Patent Application # 10/808,036 with a distinct sink component in order to make sink functionality diagnosis easier. Claim 1 of the US Patent Application # 10/808,015 recites a distinct sink component as well, such narrowing of the # 10/808,015 claim 1 scope is possible for similar reasoning.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 11-13, 17, 22, 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams, Jr. (US 6202211 B1) in view of Accarie et al. (US 2003/0048757 A1) in view of Salmonsen (US 2004/0049797 A1).

As to claim 1, Williams discloses an audio/video (A/V) component networking system, comprising (see Williams, fig. 4):

a source component (see Williams, fig. 3, col. 5, ll. 34-39, receiving from a source component from remote systems within another network, see col. 6, ll. 7-11, and the cable system (fig. 5) into a number of tuners (see col. 1, ll. 60-64));

a presentation device (see Williams, fig. 4, a TV);

and a sink component disposed remote from the source component and adapted to control presentation of A/V program data received from the source component on the presentation device (see Williams, fig. 4, STB is a sink distinct from source in the server, adapted to control, see Williams, col. 6, ll. 43-49),

the sink component adapted to transmit a command to the source component to control displaying of an A/V interface of the source component for display on the presentation device (see Williams, col. 6, ll. 43-54, if cable box is set correctly (controlled by STB) cable converter box output streams to TV via STB control).

Williams teaches control of data, but does not explicitly teach control of menu interface from the source component; Accarie, who discloses a network communication system does teach control of menu interface of the source component for display on the presentation device (see Accarie, [0395-0447], all stored commands (a menu) of a local terminal (a source) is displayed on a screen for user selection (displayed on presentation device, [0447]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of Williams with the system of Accarie to allow the user to access the menu of control functions of a remote source component (see Accarie, [0453]).

The combination of Williams and Accarie does not expressly teach control of a streaming menu interface; however, Salmonsen, who discloses network interfacing, does teach this (see Salmonsen, [0105], a media renderer (sink) controls the streaming of VOB files from the source to the display (presentation device, see control signals (fig. 3) from media source to renderer to video display to show control menus for subtitles and languages)).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of Williams and Accarie with the system of Salmonsen so that the user could make selections from a dynamic menu display presented by the sink unit (see Salmonsen, [0054]).

As to claim 13, Williams discloses an audio/video (A/V) component networking method, comprising (see Williams, fig. 4 and col. 3, ll. 20-60):

controlling, via a sink component, presentation of A/V program data received from a remote source component on a presentation device (see Williams, col. 6, ll. 43-50, STB provides the tuned TV signal to TV in selected mode);

and controlling, via a command issued by the sink component to the source component, displaying of an A/V interface of the source component for presentation on the presentation device (see Williams, col. 6, ll. 43-54, cable box channel set by IR command

(from remote control unit, controlled by STB) cable converter box outputs stream to TV via STB control).

Williams teaches control of data, but does not explicitly teach control of menu interface from the source component; Accarie, who discloses a network communication system does teach control of menu interface of the source component for display on the presentation device (see Accarie, [0395-0447], all stored commands (a menu) of a local terminal (a source) is displayed on a screen for user selection (displayed on presentation device, [0447]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of Williams with the system of Accarie to allow the user to access the menu of control functions of a remote source component (see Accarie, [0453]).

The combination of Williams and Accarie does not expressly teach control of a streaming menu interface; however, Salmonsen, who discloses network interfacing, does teach this (see Salmonsen, [0105], a media renderer (sink) controls the streaming of VOB files from the source to the display (presentation device, see control signals (fig. 3) from media source to renderer to video display to show control menus for subtitles and languages)).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of Williams and Accarie with the system of Salmonsen so that the user could make selections from a dynamic menu display presented by the sink unit (see Salmonsen, [0054]).

As to claim 27, Williams disclose an audio/video (A/V) component networking method, comprising (see Williams, fig. 4 and col. 3, ll. 20-60):

receiving, via a sink component, A/V program data from a remote source component (see Williams, col. 6, ll. 43-50, STB receives the tuned TV signal to TV in selected mode and transmits it on);

presenting the A/V program data on a presentation device (see Williams, col. 6, ll. 43-54, cable box channel set by IR command (from remote control unit, controlled by STB) cable converter box outputs stream to TV via STB control); and

Williams teaches control of data, but does not explicitly teach control of menu interface from the source component; Accarie, who discloses a network communication system does teach control of menu interface of the source component for display on the presentation device (see Accarie, [0395-0447], all stored commands (a menu) of a local terminal (a source) is displayed on a screen for user selection (displayed on presentation device, [0447]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of Williams with the system of Accarie to allow the user to access the menu of control functions of a remote source component (see Accarie, [0453]);

providing, via the sink component, a real time, automatically updating, menu interface of the source component on the presentation device (see Accarie, [0445], as

soon as terminal is selected (real-time), the list (the menu interface) of learned commands are displayed, the learned commands are updates and this is done automatically with terminal selection).

The combination of Williams and Accarie does not expressly teach control of a streaming menu interface; however, Salmonsen, who discloses network interfacing, does teach this (see Salmonsen, [0105], a media renderer (sink) controls the streaming of VOB files from the source to the display (presentation device, see control signals (fig. 3) from media source to renderer to video display to show control menus for subtitles and languages)).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of Williams and Accarie with the system of Salmonsen so that the user could make selections from a dynamic menu display presented by the sink unit (see Salmonsen, [0054]).

As to claim 28, Williams, Accarie and Salmonsen (as combined in claim 27) disclose the method of claim 27, further comprising:

Receiving an input by the sink component corresponding the menu interface presented on the presentation device (see Williams, col. 6, ll. 43-54, cable box channel set by IR command (from remote control unit—input to STB (sink)) and

Transferring the input to the source component (see Williams, col. 6, ll. 43-54, cable converter box (source) outputs stream to TV based on channel selection from STB control).

As to claim 22, Williams discloses an audio/video (A/V) component networking system, comprising (see Williams, fig. 4, and col. 3, ll. 20-60):

Means for controlling, via a sink component, presentation of A/V program data received from a remote source component on a presentation device (see Williams, col. 6, ll. 43-54, cable box channel set by IR command (from remote control unit, controlled by STB) cable converter box output streams to TV via STB control); and

Means for controlling, via a command issued by the sink component to the source component, streaming of an A/V interface from the source component for presentation on the presentation device (see Williams, col. 6, ll. 43-54, cable box channel set by IR command (from remote control unit, controlled by STB) cable converter box output streams to TV via STB control).

Williams teaches control of data, but does not explicitly teach control of menu interface from the source component; Accarie, who discloses a network communication system does teach control of menu interface of the source component for display on the presentation device (see Accarie, [0395-0447], all stored commands (a menu) of a local terminal (a source) is displayed on a screen for user selection (displayed on presentation device, [0447]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of Williams with the system of Accarie to allow the user to access the menu of control functions of a remote source component (see Accarie, [0453]).

The combination of Williams and Accarie does not expressly teach control of a streaming menu interface; however, Salmonsen, who discloses network interfacing, does teach this (see Salmonsen, [0105], a media renderer (sink) controls the streaming of VOB files from the source to the display (presentation device, see control signals (fig. 3) from media source to renderer to video display to show control menus for subtitles and languages)).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of Williams and Accarie with the system of Salmonsen so that the user could make selections from a dynamic menu display presented by the sink unit (see Salmonsen, [0054]).

As to claim 3, Williams, Accarie and Salmonsen (as combined in claim 1) disclose the system of claim 1, wherein the sink component is adapted to enable the user to acces the A/V menu interface associated with the source component (see Accarie, [0395-0447], all stored commands (a menu) of a local terminal (a source) is displayed on a screen for user selection (displayed on presentation device, [0447] is access to the A/V menu interface (see Accarie, [0398])).

As to claim 5, Williams, Accarie and Salmonsen discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the sink component is adapted to transfer the A/V program data via a plurality of different types of communication networks (see Accarie, [0249-252], switching between A/V networks of different types (1355/1394) transferring data, the storage means is capable of handling different packet types [0257]).

As to claim 7, Williams, Accarie and Salmonsen (as combined in claim 1) disclose the system of claim 1, wherein at least one of the source components is selected from the group consisting of a satellite receiver source component, a digital versatile disk (DVD) source component, a compact disc (CD) source component, a computer, and a cable source component (see Williams, fig. 5 and col. 5, ll. 35-45, cable source component).

As to claim 11, Williams, Accarie and Salmonsen (as combined in claim 1) disclose the system of claim 1, wherein the sink component is adapted to control a menu function associated with the A/V program data (see Williams, col. 6, ll. 43-54, cable box channel set by IR command, a menu function associated with the A/V program data from cable box (a source) (from remote control unit, controlled by STB) cable converter box output streams to TV via STB control).

As to claim 12, Williams, Accarie and Salmonsen (as combined in claim 1) disclose the system of claim 1, wherein the sink component is adapted to access an A/V program data library of the source component (see Accarie, [0371], a local node (sink) receives program data (from source) and stores in RAM).

As to claim 17, Williams, Accarie and Salmonsen (as combined in claim 13) disclose the system of claim 13, wherein controlling, via a command issued by the sink component, comprises transmitting the command to at least one of the group consisting of a satellite receiver component, a digital versatile disk (DVD) component, a cable component, a computer, and a compact disk (CD) component (see Williams, col. 6, ll. 43-54, cable box channel set by IR command (from remote control unit, controlled by STB) cable converter box outputs stream to TV via STB control).

6. Claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 14-16, 18, 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams, Jr. (US 6202211 B1) in view of Accarie et al. (US 2003/0048757 A1) in view of Salmonsen (US 2004/0049797 A1) in view of Hunter et al. (US 2002/0056118 A1).

As to claim 2, Williams, Accarie and Salmonsen (as combined in claim 1) disclose the system of claim 1, .

The combination of Williams, Accarie and Salmonsen does not teach wherein the sink component is adapted to decode the A/V program data; however, Hunter, who discloses an audio-video distribution system, does teach this (see Hunter, [0065] decoder is part of user station, a STB [0037]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of Williams, Accarie and Salmonsen with the system of Hunter adding intelligence to the STB or user station and allowing for a simpler network fabric (see Hunter, [0065]).

As to claim 4, Williams, Accarie and Salmonsen (as combined in claim 1) disclose the method of claim 1,

The combination of Williams, Accarie and Salmonsen does not explicitly teach further comprising performing a registration operation to register the source component with the sink component; however, Hunter does teach this (see Hunter, [0163-0165], the sink registers the CD or another type of media player for playback).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of Williams, Accarie and Salmonsen with the system of Hunter in order to recognize multiple sources of programming data allowing the end user variety in his entertainment choice (see Hunter, [0164]).

As to claim 6, Williams, Accarie and Salmonsen (as combined in claim 1) disclose the system of claim 1,

The combination of Williams, Accarie and Salmonsen does not explicitly teach wherein the sink component is adapted to perform a registration operation to register a format of the A/V program data available from each of the plurality of source components; however, Hunter does teach this (see Hunter, [0163-0165], the sink registers the format of a CD or another type of storage media for playback).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of Williams, Accarie and Salmonsen with the system of Hunter in order for program format to be variable from the content sources, making for a more robust entertainment system (see Hunter, [0164]).

As to claim 8, Williams, Accarie and Salmonsen (as combined in claim 1) disclose the system of claim 1,

The combination of Williams, Accarie and Salmonsen does not expressly teach wherein the sink component is adapted to perform a registration operation to register the presentation device with the sink component; however, Hunter does teach this (see Hunter, [0142] through communication with the on-screen GUI (of the presentation device) the user station, sink, realizes information about the user preferences for display on the presentation device, hence registers the device).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of Williams, Accarie and Salmonsen with the system of Hunter in order to allow the system to correctly recognize the device data is sent to for display therefore no delay in user interaction with the data occurs (see Hunter, [0142]).

As to claims 14 and 25, they are analyzed similar to claim 4.

As to claims 16 and 24, they are analyzed similar to claim 2.

As to claim 18, it is analyzed similar to claim 3.

As to claim 15, it is analyzed similar to claim 6.

7.   Claims 9, 10, 20, 21, 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams, Jr. (US 6202211 B1) in view of Accarie et al. (US 2003/0048757 A1) in view of Salmonsen (US 2004/0049797 A1) in view of Williams et al. (US 2004/0019908 A1— hereafter known as Chris Williams).

As to claim 9, Williams, Accarie and Salmonsen (as combined in claim 1) disclose the

system of claim 1,

The combination of Williams, Accarie and Salmonsen does not explicitly teach wherein

the sink component is adapted to present to the user a filtered aggregated listing of the A/V

program data available from each of the plurality of source components based on a format of the

A/V program data available from each of the plurality of source components; however Chris

Williams does teach this (see Chris Williams, fig. 5, each source has a different data format).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the system of Williams, Accarie and Salmonsen with the system

of Chris Williams in order to allow the end user the pleasure of entertainment from several various

sources (see Chris Williams, [0026]).

As to claim 10, Williams, Accarie and Salmonsen (as combined in claim 1) disclose the

system of claim 1,

The combination of Williams, Accarie and Salmonsen does not explicitly teach wherein

the sink component is adapted to present to the user a filtered aggregated listing of the A/V

program data available from each of the plurality of source components based on a type of the

presentation device; however Chris Williams does teach this (see Chris Williams, fig. 5, the audio

data will be reproduced on an audio presenter, speaker system of fig. 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the system of Williams, Accarie and Salmonsen with the system

of Chris Williams in order to allow the end user the pleasure of entertainment from several various

sources (see Chris Williams, [0026]).

As to claim 20, it is analyzed similar to claim 9.

As to claims 21 and 26, they are analyzed similar to claim 10

Inquiries

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Paul J. Graham whose telephone number is 571-270-

1705. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00a-5:00p EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Vivek Srivastava can be reached on 571-272-7304. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished `applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO

Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call

800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

pjg
1/17/08

ANDREW Y. KOENIG
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER